

derogatory information for partisan political purposes. The evidence simply did not support this theory. Nor was there any evidence that Mr. Marceca was an unwitting participant in a conspiracy involving senior officials to obtain information from confidential FBI background reports.

Finally, the evidence established that certain portions of Mr. Marceca's testimony before Congress were knowingly false. However, in light of other evidence that no senior White House officials or Mrs. Clinton were involved in Mr. Marceca's requests, the Independent Counsel concluded that the interests in full disclosure of all relevant information, especially information relating to any possible involvement of senior White House officials in Mr. Marceca's activities, justified a grant of immunity. His testimony under a grant of immunity contributed to the Independent Counsel's conclusion that no senior White House official or Mrs. Clinton engaged in any criminal conduct related to Mr. Marceca's requests for FBI background reports. Mr. Marceca's testimony under that grant of immunity also confirmed that he had falsely testified before Congress about certain aspects of his review of the reports for content.

A. The Evidence Does Not Support the Conclusion that Mr. Marceca's Conduct Reflected a Conspiracy Involving Senior White House Officials or Mrs. Clinton to Obtain Confidential Background Reports.

In concluding that there was no evidence that Mr. Marceca's conduct reflected a conspiracy involving senior White House